

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed December 4, 2009 ("Office Action"). Claims 1-8, 17-19, and 21-29 were and rejected. Claims 1-2, 4, 17, and 21 are amended herein. Claims 31-32 are newly added. Support for the amendments presented herein can be found in the specification as originally filed, at least from paragraphs 28, 40, and 47. Paragraph 5 of the specification is amended herein to clarify that web sites have different domain names. No new matter is introduced. Through these changes, claims 1-8, 17-19, 21-29, and 31-21 are pending. This Reply encompasses a bona fide attempt to overcome the rejections raised by the Examiner. Applicant believes that claims 1-8, 17-19, 21-29, and 31-21 recite subject matter not reached by the art of record and therefore should be allowed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Interview Summary

Pursuant to Applicant Initiated Interview Request submitted on February 24, 2010, a telephonic interview was conducted on March 2, 2010 between Primary Examiner Cesar Paula and the undersigned. During the interview, the undersigned explained the invention as claimed, compared the claimed invention with the art of record, particularly the Yahoo! host page and the MyYahoo! page of the Yahoo! website, and provided technical documents, cited herein via Information Disclosure Statement, disclosing example source code of the Yahoo! host page and the MyYahoo! page of the Yahoo! website dated January 1999 and W3C definitions dated May 1999. Applicant respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is directed to sharing assets between different websites having different domain names and agreed to amend the independent claims accordingly. Primary Examiner Cesar Paula indicated that such an amendment might be sufficient to overcome the current rejections based on Yahoo!, although a further search would be conducted. Primary Examiner Cesar Paula further suggested adding dependent claims direct to the management aspect of sharing assets between different web sites. Applicant also agreed and added claims 31-32 herein accordingly. No agreement was reached with respect to the allowability of these claims. Applicant appreciates the time and effort taken by Primary Examiner Cesar Paula to review Applicant's present application and discuss the pending claims and the cited prior art.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and New Claims 31-32

Claims 17-19 and 21-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MyYahoo.com Help Pages, Archive.org, 1999 (Yahoo) in view of Kelly. As submitted in the aforementioned Examiner Interview, Yahoo does not disclose sharing assets between different web sites. Kelly fails to cure this deficiency. Conventionally, sharing assets between web sites is complicated by the fact that different web sites have different domain names. Embodiments as claimed can address this problem by enabling a parent web site to share its assets with a child web site in one of three modes. See Specification, ¶¶7 and 9. In some embodiments, assets can be shared between multiple parent-child pairs, but they are shared on a pair by pair basis. See Specification, ¶8. The child web site does not actually contain a second instance of the assets, but instead has references to the parent's assets. See Specification, ¶28. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, dependent claim 31 is newly added herein to recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the child web site contains references to the one or more assets of the parent web site." In some embodiments, an application is configured to generate management pages for the child sites such that the sharing which can be performed is constrained in this manner. See Specification, ¶47. Again, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, dependent claim 32 is newly added herein to recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the asset sharing management application is configured to generate management pages for the child web site."

Applicant respectfully submits that embodiments implementing a hierarchical asset sharing model for sharing assets between different website as set forth in the claims can make the most efficient use of the assets, providing technological advantages not achieved by the art of record. See *also*, Specification, ¶¶40-41. As a good faith effort to expedite the prosecution of the present application, independent claim 17 is amended herein to recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the first and second domain names are different," and independent claim 21 is amended herein to recite, *inter alia*, "selecting two objects which have different domain names." Applicant believes that the amendments to claims 17 and 21 sufficiently overcome the rejections with respect to claims 17-19 and 21-29 and that claims 17-19 and 21-29 recite subject matter not reached by the art of record under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and therefore should be allowed. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections with respect to claims 17-19 and 21-29 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahoo in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,983,227 ("Nazem"), further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0078140 ("Kelly"), and Dunigan et al. "MCSC Training Guide: Windows NT Workstation 4.0," New Riders Publishing, 1997, pp.141-192 (Dunigan). Applicant respectfully submits that Yahoo combined with Kelly generally fails to disclose sharing assets between different websites and particularly fails to disclose, *inter alia*, "wherein the parent and child web sites are configured to share the one or more assets of the parent web site using a set of asset sharing modes," as recited in claim 1. As a good faith effort to expedite the prosecution of the present application, independent claim 1 is amended herein to recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the parent and child web sites have different domain names." Applicant believes that the amendments to claim 1 sufficiently overcome the rejections with respect to claims 1-8 and that claims 1-8 recite subject matter not reached by the art of record under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and therefore should be allowed. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections with respect to claims 1-8 is respectfully requested.

* * * * *

Conclusion

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include any acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of claims 1-8, 17-19, 21-29, and 31-21. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of Sprinkle IP Law Group.

Respectfully submitted,

Sprinkle IP Law Group
Attorneys for Applicant



Katharina W. Schuster
Reg. No. 50,000

Dated: March 2, 2010
1301 W. 25th Street
Suite 408
Austin, Texas 78705
Tel. (512) 637-9223
Fax. (512) 371-9088